(b) whether the Government propose to provide any concession to the telephone subscribers in the rural areas; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI BENI PRASAD VARMA): (a) The demands for Grants of the Department of Telecom for the year 1996-97 is yet to be approved by the Parliament. Hence the allocation of funds state-wise (circle-wise) will be made after the approval of the Demands for Grants for 1996-97 by the Parliament. As per the total demand placed in the Parliament, Rs. 983.13 crores is for Rural Areas for the year 1996-97.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise in view of (b) above.

Air Strips

3385. SHRI R.B. RAI: Will the Minister of CIVIL AVIATION be pleased to state:

(a) the number of air-strips in the country as on date, State-wise, location-wise;

(b) whether the Government propose to construct more air-strips particularly in interior places;

(c) if so, the details thereof; and

(d) the amount earmarked during 1996-97 for the purpose?

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI C.M. IBRAHIM): (a) A list of airports controlled by Airports Authority of India in the country, State-wise and location-wise is enclosed as Statement.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) New airports are being constructed at Tura (Meghalaya) and Lengpui (Mizoram) under the State Plans, Kargil (J&K), Androth (Lakshadweep, Islands) and Kishtwar (J&K) are funded by the Central Government.

(d) Amount earmarked during 1996-97:

Tura	—	Rs. 7 crores
Lengpui	—	Rs. 10 crores
Kargil	—	Rs. 6 crores
Androth	—	Rs. 1 crores
Kishtwar	—	Rs. 0.50 crores

STATEMENT

Airports Authority cf India

List of Civil Enclaves and Airports

Andhra Pradesh		
1. Vishakhapatnam	1.	Rajamundry
	2.	Tirupati
	3.	Vijaywada
	4.	Cuddapah
	5.	Donakonda
	6.	Warrangal
	7.	Hyderabad
Arunachal Pradesh		
2. Along	8.	Passighat
3. Daparijo		
4. Tezu		
5. Zero		
Assam		
6. Jorhat	9.	Dibrugarh
7. Silchar	10.	Guwahati
8. Tezpur	11.	Lilabari
	12.	Rupsi
	13.	Shella
Bihar		
	14.	Patna
	15.	Ranchi
	16.	Chakulia
	17.	Gava
	18.	Jogbani
	19.	Muzzafarpur
	20.	Raxaul
Delhi		
	21.	Indira Gandhi International Airport
	22.	Safdarjung
Goa		
9. Dabolim		

Gujarat

10. Bhuj
11. Jamnagar
23. Ahmedabad
24. Rajkot
25. Vadodara
26. Kandla
27. Keshod
28. Porbandar
29. Bhavnagar
30. Deesa

Himachal Pradesh

31. Kulu
32. Shimla
33. Gaggal

Jammu & Kashmir

12. Jammu
13. Srinagar
14. Leh

Karnataka

15. Bangalore
34. Mangalore
35. Hassan
36. Hubli
37. Mysore
38. Belgaum

Kerala

16. Cochin
39. Thiruvananthapuram International Airport
40. Calicut

Maharashtra

17. Pune
41. Bombay International Airport
42. Nagpur
43. Aurangabad
44. Kolhapur
45. Akola
46. Juhu Bombay
47. Sholapur

Madhya Pradesh

18. Gwalior
48. Bhopal
49. Indore
50. Khajuraho
51. Raipur
52. Jabalpur
53. Khandwa
54. Panna
55. Satna
56. Bilaspur

Manipur

57. Imphal

Meghalaya

58. Shillong

Mizoram

59. Aizwal

Nagaland

60. Dimapur

Orissa

61. Bhubaneshwar
62. Jharsuguda

Punjab

63. Amritsar
64. Ludhiana

Rajasthan

19. Bikaner
20. Jodhpur
21. Jaisalmer
65. Jaipur
66. Udaipur
67. Kota

Tamil Nadu

68. Madras International Airport
69. Coimbatore
70. Madurai
71. Tiruchirapalli
72. Tuticorin
73. Vellore
74. Salem

Tripura

75. Kamalpur
76. Kailashahar
77. Khowai
78. Agartala

Uttar Pradesh

22. Kanpur (Chakori)
23. Agra
24. Allahabad
25. Gorakhpur
79. Varanasi
80 Lucknow
81. Dehra Dun
82. Pant Nagar
83. Jhansi
84. Kanpur Civil
85. Lalitpur

West Bengal

26. Bagdogra
86. Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose International Airport
87. Cooch Behar
88. Balurghat
89. Behala
90. Malda

Pondicherry (U.T.)

91. Pondicherry

Andaman & Nicobar (U.T.)

27. Port Blair

Chandigarh (U.T.)

28. Chandigarh

Lakshdweep (U.T.)

92. Agatti

Appeal against Industrial Tribunal Award

3386. SHRI SOUMYA RANJAN: Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases in which the Food Corporation of India has appealed against the award given by the Industrial Tribunal during the last three years;

(b) the details of such cases where the guidelines given by the Government have been violated;

(c) whether any appeal has been made against the awards where guidelines have been violated;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND MINISTER OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV): (a) In twenty cases during the last three years the Food Corporation of India has appealed against the awards given by Industrial Tribunals.

(b) to (d). Required details are given in the *Statement* enclosed.

(e) Does not arise.

STATEMENT

Sl. No.	Details of cases in which the Food Corporation of India has appealed against the awards of the Industrial Tribunals during the last three years
1.	ID. No. 72/94 was raised by Sh. B. Namdakumar ex-casual labour, Madras. The Award was examined by SRM, Madras in consultation with JM (Legal) of Zonal Office (South) with the concurrance of our Counsel who opined that the Industrial Tribunal has acted without evidence regarding the total number of days worked by the Petitioner. The competent authority decided to file appeal against the award to obtain stay from High Court on operation of Award. WP filed in High Court vide No. 2189/96.
2.	ID No. 51/86 was raised by Sh. K. Gowriah and others of Nalgonda District. The Hamali workers were working under the contractor for handling foodgrains in depot and not under direct employment of FCI. Hence the Award suggesting to reinstate them in FCI has been challenged in consultation with the Advocate as contract labour are not eligible to seek employment in FCI. The matter is pending in the Court. (WP No. 2228/93 in A.P. High Court).
3.	ID No. 58/92 was raised by Sh. S.A. Ismail, Kurnool. The Industrial Tribunal has errad in passing the award without considering the fact that the worker has not put in 240 days continuous service in a calander year. The SRM, Hyderabad has decided to file appeal against the Tribunal Award. The appeal filed vide WP No. 18879/95 is pending in AP High Court.
4.	ID No. 59/92 was raised by Sh. G. Purushotham, Kurnool. The case is of similar nature as above at 3 therefore appeal filed vide WP No. 18883/95 in AP High Court.